

On the humanitarian front this policy reversal would represent a death knell to future efforts on the part of the U.S. to get the U.N. and other countries to cooperate with us in addressing a migration flow where there is belief that some, but not all, the members of that population may be refugees.

This policy reversal is based on a misapprehension that the screening procedures in the region have been basically flawed. The fact is that massive international effort and resources have gone into screening the applicants in this region. Indeed, more effort has been made in southeast Asia to determine whether someone meets the refugee definition than in any other part of the world. The international standard of who is a refugee is incorporated in this review process. This international standard was incorporated in the Refugee Act of 1980 into U.S. law and in turn into the Worldwide Processing Guidelines of the INS.

The implementation of this standard is subjective. In order to protect against errors reviews of problematic cases are possible under current arrangements. If there is reasonable doubt regarding some of the recent decisions a more effective way to address these concerns would be to encourage a review of the few cases where there is an issue. It is an overreaction to scuttle the CPA when problems can be worked out within its framework and procedures.

Significant effort has been made to promote voluntary repatriation of those determined not be refugees and to provide monitoring of their situation back in Vietnam once they return. So far as I know, UNHCR has not reported any instances of situations where Vietnamese who have returned have been persecuted or been maltreated. The effects of this provision, of course, would be to cut funds which can support the return, monitoring, and assistance to the Vietnamese who go back either voluntarily or involuntarily.

The intention may be to reserve funds for the resettlement of a larger number of Vietnamese or Laotians. So long, however, as the refugee definition is the standard that is used to adjudicate claims, the reality is going to be that very few of the people in the camps will meet the standard.

While I would be against it, we can, of course, decide, bilaterally, to admit Vietnamese and Laotians under the terms of the Lautenberg Amendment. It is, however, unreasonable to expect that the countries in the region who are adjudicating these claims with UNHCR oversight would be willing to apply this standard to their own review of these cases.

Given strong sentiments in this country to restrict the numbers of new immigrants, my guess is that there would be strong opposition to bringing substantial numbers of Vietnamese and Laotians to the U.S., either as refugees or special humanitarian entrants. It is also unlikely that normal immigration numbers would be allocated to this group as there has been an effort to get Vietnamese to apply for immigration to the U.S. from within Vietnam. If these assumptions are true then the result of this expression of sympathy for the Vietnamese in the camps that have been screened out can be to provide them with a false hope. At best, it could lead to a situation where people who were becoming reconciled to returning to their country would re-commit themselves to remaining in the camps. Worse outcomes could be a renewed flow of boat people and even worse riots or other disruptions and violence in the camps.

As a former official with the Office of Refugee Resettlement during the peak of the Indochinese refugee resettlement program, I cannot personally be accused of lack of sym-

pathy or concern for the plight of the Indochinese. I feel the decisions made around the Comprehensive Plan of Action were the right decisions, both for the countries concerned and the migrants involved. To reverse course now will have negative effects on efforts to address the plight of refugees everywhere.

Thank you for seeking my comments on this matter.

Sincerely,

DENNIS GALLAGHER,
Executive Director.

THE TAX FAIRNESS FOR FARMERS, RANCHERS, AND SMALL BUSINESSES ACT

HON. TIM JOHNSON

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1995

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce legislation that will provide for tax changes to benefit farmers, ranchers, and small businesses. This legislation is entitled the "Tax Fairness for Farmers, Ranchers, and Small Businesses Act."

This bill contains three major changes in Federal tax policy which will help to support farmers and ranchers through bad years, support the entry into business of beginning farmers, ranchers and small businesses, and place family farmers, ranchers and small businesses on a level playing field with their corporate counterparts.

The first change this bill would make is to create a form of income averaging under which farmers and ranchers would be permitted to carry forward any standard deductions and personal exemptions that go unused during a low-income year. This would help farmers and ranchers even out the cycle of ups and downs in agricultural income caused by the weather, giving them increased ability to recover after a devastating year.

Second, this bill would help promote beginning farmers and small businesses, by allowing a one-time capital gains exemption up to \$500,000 for farmers and ranchers over 55 who sell their farm or ranch to a qualified beginning farmer or a lineal descendant, and by allowing a similar exemption for owners of small businesses who sell the business to a lineal descendant. A retiring farmer would therefore have an incentive to sell his land to a beginning farmer, and because of the tax break he would be able to offer that land for sale at a lower price than he otherwise might demand.

Third, this legislation would establish and make permanent a 100-percent deduction of health insurance premiums for self-employed persons. Corporations have the ability to deduct the full cost of their health insurance premiums, and it is only fair for farmers and small business owners to have the same right. It is time for this inequity to end.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and the rest of my colleagues join me in supporting this legislation, and work with me to bring tax fairness to our Nation's family farmers, ranchers, and small business owners.

TRIBUTE TO A 31ST DISTRICT VOLUNTEER

HON. AMO HOUGHTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1995

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take a minute to make a few remarks in recognition of a very special lady. Dorothy Brownell is a remarkable woman. She has a wonderful blend of energy, wit, and commitment. She keeps everyone around her on their toes.

A former school dental hygienist, she officially retired in 1976. I got to know her during her second career—as a volunteer. For more than 7 years, she has been the cornerstone of our Jamestown district office. She could write the book on volunteerism—that is, if she ever slowed down long enough to put pen to paper.

Let me recap just a few of her interests. She has dished up food at a local food bank; is an officer with the local chapter of the American Association of Retired Persons, Foster Grandparents Program, and the United Senior Council; worked with the United Way; has been an ombudsman for long-term care at an area nursing home, and worked on the county Veterans' Listing Program. You'll have to take my word for it—this litany only scratches the surface. Other activities have been sandwiched between trips to Ireland, Italy, and any number of our own States.

Dorothy has been recognized for her efforts. She received the New York State Legislative Achievement Award; was named United Senior Council's 1990 Senior Citizen of the year; received a Certificate of Achievement from Manor Oak Nursing Home and another for her work with Catholic Charities Outreach for the Aging. On top of that, Dorothy took a silver medal for swimming in the 1990 Senior Olympics.

What prompts my remarks today is that Dorothy, at the tender age of 77, is calling it quits. She's launching her second retirement with a train trip across Canada and following up with courses at Elderhostels. To record that she'll be missed is an understatement—but this little lady with the great big heart deserves the very best life has to offer.

SALUTE TO DR. RAYMOND M. OLSON

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1995

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute a selfless community leader and educator who has spent his life helping those around him find strength and guidance through two principal sources—education and religion.

Dr. Raymond M. Olson was born nearly 85 years ago on a farm near Eagle Grove, IA. But those of us who make our homes in Ventura County are grateful for the fact that he found his way out West and has selflessly dedicated himself to improving the lives of the people around him.

In his long, distinguished and varied career, Dr. Olson has served as a teacher, a pastor

in the Lutheran Church, president of the National Lutheran council and president of the California Lutheran College in Thousand Oaks. He now holds the title of president emeritus of California Lutheran university and continues to maintain his ties to the school.

Dr. Olson's impressive career accomplishments are rivaled only by a tireless dedication to his community and extensive record of public service.

He has served on the Ventura County grand jury, the board of directors of the Conejo Valley Historical Society, the United Fund of Ventura County, various boards of education, the Cultural Center Planning Committee and has been a member of the Thousand Oaks Rotary Club since 1963.

In addition to these numerous professional and philanthropic commitments, Dr. Olson and his wife of nearly 60 years, Helen, have raised two daughter and a son.

In short, Mr. Speaker, I believe that Dr. Raymond M. Olson has truly served his family and his community through a lifetime of service and selflessness.

He was recently selected as the 1995 Patriotic Citizen of the Year by the Conejo Valley chapter of the Military Order of the World Wars and was presented with the Chapter's Silver Patrick Henry Medallion. This recognition was truly appropriate, because one of the basic tenets of the organization is that it is better to serve than to be served.

Dr. Olson has lived his life in strict adherence to this belief and has backed up this opinion with an unparalleled record of action and dedication to others. I commend him to all in this body and congratulate him on his award.

STATEMENT RECOGNIZING NORENE COLLER THE 1995 REGION 2 EPA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AWARD RECIPIENT

HON. SUE W. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1995

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my congratulations to Norene Coller, a constituent of mine who was recently awarded an Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] Environmental Quality Award for region 2, which includes New York, New Jersey, and Puerto Rico.

Over the past 20 years, Ms. Coller has devoted herself to improving the quality of the environment in region 2, and to increasing public involvement in environmental action. As a biology teacher in Hyde Park, NY, Ms. Coller has involved her eighth grade students in innovative environmental brainstorming exercises. A renowned volunteer of the Dutchess County Environmental Management Council [EMC], Ms. Coller has served as the council's chairperson since 1982. And under her direction, EMC has fulfilled the needs of the community by formulating a comprehensive agenda to battle the growing problems associated with hazardous and solid waste management. Ms. Coller's energetic direction, as both an educator and public servant, has increased the quality of the environment of region 2.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in recognizing the fine achievements of Ms. Coller.

She is to be commended for her dedicated service to the community, and should be noted as a true friend of the environment.

HOOSIER FARMERS URGE CONTINUED SUPPORT FOR EXPORTS AND RESEARCH

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the results of my 1995 farm bill questionnaire. The questionnaire responses indicate most Hoosier farmers are willing to accept less funding for farm programs, but only in the context of broader spending reductions. While farm programs should not be singled out for funding cuts, I am pleased—but not surprised—that Hoosier farmers are willing to do their fair share to balance the budget. Among the different agricultural programs, cuts in crop support payments received the broadest acceptance, with nearly 63 percent favoring reductions.

Hoosier farmers gave their strongest support to funding for promoting U.S. exports and agricultural research and education. I agree with this shift in priorities. The 1995 farm bill should be more market-oriented while preserving our competitive edge in world markets.

Of those responding, 64 percent had participated in Federal farm programs in the last 5 years, 75 percent of whom received 10 percent or less of their yearly farm revenue from direct payments. Farmers also expressed their support for limiting farm payments for wealthier farmers, while rejecting proposals to guarantee all farmers a minimum income. Hoosiers also support Congress' decision last year to abolish the Disaster Assistance Program.

I thank the many Hoosiers who answered the questionnaire, and I appreciate their careful consideration of these important agricultural issues.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

(The results may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding and multiple responses.)

1. What general policy direction do you favor for the 1995 farm bill?

	(percent)	
Extend current programs	13.3	
Extend current programs with changes	37.6	
Replace with an alternative	13.7	
Eliminate farm programs	35.4	

2. Current federal spending on programs that directly benefit farmers is approximately \$18.8 billion per year. The overall level of funding is likely to decrease for 1996, and Congress may reorganize spending priorities among the following programs. For each category please indicate whether you think spending should be increased, decreased, or kept the same.

(In percent)

	Increase	Same	Decrease	Don't know
Commodity support programs ..	8.6	26.1	62.7	2.6
Conservation reserve program ..	8.9	33.8	55.0	2.3
Research and extension	19.5	39.0	39.0	3.4
Other conservation programs ...	1.4	31.1	54.4	5.7
Export promotion activities	27.9	36.5	31.8	3.9
Crop insurance	10.0	33.5	50.8	5.8
Farm credit programs	9.3	31.1	52.0	7.5

3. If commodity programs must be reduced, which of the following deficit-cutting options would you favor?

	(percent)
Cutting target prices	12.1
Raise acreage reserve program (ARP) levels	11.0
Raise loan rates	12.9
Reduce \$50,000 payment limitation cap	38.8
Establish income ceiling	48.7

4. Some farm groups have suggested abolishing all current farm programs and using the funds for an income support level of 70 percent of each farmer's historical income. Farmers would then be free to farm according to their interpretation of the markets, with the assurance that in a bad year they would receive no less than 70 percent of their usual income. Do you:

	(Percent)
Favor this concept	21.9
Favor this concept with changes	16.6
Oppose this concept	60.4

5. The Conservation Reserve Program [CRP] pays farmers a yearly fee per acre to keep certain land out of production. The program decreases soil erosion, encourages wildlife and boosts commodity prices by controlling supply. CRP expires this year. Should Congress:

	(Percent)
Continue CRP as is	26.2
Focus payments on more environmentally sensitive areas	22.6
Phase out CRP	35.3
Allow more acres in CRP with reduced payments	15.9

6. There are growing concerns among consumers about the possible effects of pesticide use on the environment and public health. If pesticide use should be monitored, which one of the following proposals would you most support?

	(Percent)
Promote extension programs to curb pesticide use	22.5
Establish more controls over pesticide use	8.7
Provide more incentives for alternative farming practices	36.1
Do not change current policy	32.8

7. The Ad Hoc Disaster Assistance Program has been replaced by a much broader Federal crop insurance program. Instead of irregular and expensive disaster payments, farmers in USDA programs will now enroll in a basic catastrophic insurance policy, with subsidies to provide more comprehensive insurance. Which of the following options do you favor?

	(Percent)
Keep the current system	33.9
Return to the ad hoc disaster payments	5.6
Modify the current crop insurance system	35.7
Eliminate all federal emergency assistance	24.8

8. The Uruguay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT] reduces agricultural subsidies in foreign countries. Because U.S. subsidies are already far lower than our competitors', other countries will make larger cuts in their farm programs. Would you favor further reductions in worldwide farm subsidies, even if some commodity prices and U.S. farm programs might be reduced?

	(Percent)
Yes	49.7
No	19.2
Don't know	31.1

9. Food and nutrition programs are often described as "indirect" farm programs because they increase food purchases by some \$30 or \$60 billion per year. They are also a source of urban support for the farm bill. Which of the following food and nutrition proposals do you most favor?